

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 2, 4 and 8-18 stand finally rejected. The Applicant requests the withdrawal of finality and allowance of all the claims.

Improper finality

The finality of the Office Action is improper. The Applicant responded to the previous final action requesting withdrawal of finality as it was not necessitated by the applicant amendment. The Applicant's previous response stated "The features previously presented in dependent Claim 3 have been incorporated into independent claim 1, and therefore do not require a new search. Furthermore, the Office Action has never addressed all the limitations of Claim 3, and therefore the Applicant is entitled to a new Office Action." (Page 5 of Response of February 28, 2005)

Now, the current Office Action claims the submission of an IDS prompted the new grounds of rejection and thus the Action is made final and cites MPEP§ 609(b)(2)(i).

MPEP §609(b)(2)(i) states:

“ If information submitted during the period set fourth in 37 CFR 1.97(c) with a statement under 37 CFR 1.97(e) is used in a new ground of rejection on un-amended claims, the next Office action will not be made final since in this situation it is

clear that applicant has submitted the information to the Office promptly after it has become known and the information is being submitted prior to a final determination on patentability by the Office.”

The Applicant requests the examiner to specify how this statement facilitates the application of Finality.

Furthermore MPEP 706.07(b) states explicitly that a final rejection is not proper in this case.

MPEP 706.07(b)

“However, it would not be proper to make final a first Office action in a continuing or substitute application where that application contains material which was presented in the earlier application after final rejection of closing of prosecution but was denied entry because (A) new issues were raised that required further consideration and /or search, or (B) the issue of new matter was raised.”

The Examiner is invited to review the Advisory Action of March 6, 2005 in which the Examiner stated the amendments would not be entered because they raised new issues that would require further consideration and or search.

It is clear for several reasons the finality of this Action is improper and must be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections

Claims 1, 2, 4, 8, 11 and 16 stand improperly rejected as being anticipated by Halm.

Claim 1, recites *inter alia* “the plastic body which surrounds the stator is an integral one piece molded body defining a first bearing seat for receiving a first bearing at the first shaft end and a second bearing seat for receiving a second bearing at the second shaft end in an interior wall of said chamber.”

The claim requires a second bearing seat in the plastic body. However, Halm does not disclose such a second bearing seat.

An English translation of Halm states “a sliding bearing 111 inserted into a camp carrier 112” and “between this sliding bearing 111 and the camp carrier 112 on the one

hand as well as the housing of the circulating heating pump 101 a filter ring 113 is arranged in the drilling of the housing 102 aligning with the drilling of the stand 103.”

The housing 102 of Halm does not include a bearing seat on the body at the second end, rather a camp carrier 112 and a filter ring 113 form a seat for the bearing 111 on the second shaft end of Halm. This can easily be seen in Figures 4, 5, 9 and 10. Therefore, in no manner could Halm anticipate Claim 1.

Furthermore, as Claims 2, 4, 8, 11 and 16 depend from Claim 1, they also cannot be anticipated by Halm, irrespective of the additional features recited therein.

The rejection of Claims 1, 2, 4, 8, 11 and 16 must be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

I. The Office incorrectly rejected Claim 9 as being obvious over Halm in view of Berger.

Berger also does not show the plastic body which surrounds the stator is an integral one piece molded body defining a first bearing seat for receiving a first bearing at the first shaft end and a second bearing seat for receiving a second bearing at the second shaft end in an interior wall of said chamber, as recited in Claim 1, from which Claim 9 depends. Therefore, since Berger does not obviate the deficiencies of Halm. The combination of Halm and Berger cannot render Claim 1 and likewise Claim 9 obvious.

The rejection of Claim 9 must be withdrawn.

II. The Office incorrectly rejected Claims 10, 12-14, 17 and 18 as being obvious over Halm and Akutsu.

The Office uses Akutsu for providing three phase windings for the purpose of making a three phase motor. However Akutsu does not obviate the deficiencies of Halm, particularly related to the body having a second bearing seat.

Therefore, since the combination of Halm and Akutsu cannot render Claim 1 obvious, it cannot render Claims 10, 12-14, 17 and 18, which depend from Claim 1, obvious irrespective of the additional features recited therein.

The rejection of Claims 10, 12-14, 17 and 18 must be withdrawn.

III. The Office incorrectly rejected Claim 15 as being obvious over Halm and Turk.

The Office uses Turk to provide a teaching for using metal parts to shield the motor. However, irrespective of such a proposed teaching, Turk does not obviate the deficiencies of Halm as addressed above and therefore fails to form a proper rejection.

The combination of Halm and Turk cannot render Claim 1, from which Claim 15 depends obvious and thus cannot render Claim 15 obvious irrespective of the additional features recited therein.

The rejection of Claim 15 must be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

The Applicant has highlighted that a clear non obvious difference of the invention as described in the current claims and the cited prior art is that the motor housing, i.e., plastic body, is integrally formed, i.e., it is a one-piece component, and at each end includes a bearing seat into which respective bearings are inserted. None of the prior art references teach such a feature. Therefore the Applicants request withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the application including Claims 1, 2, 4, 8-18.

Application Serial No.: 10/687,834
Amendment dated October 5, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed: August 17, 2005

Although an extension of time is not deemed necessary at this time, the Office is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate extension fee to Deposit Account No.

04-1679, Duane Morris LLP.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark C. Comtois	Reg. No. 46,285
L. Lawton Rogers, III	Reg. No. 24,302
D. Joseph English	Reg. No. 42,514
Patrick D. McPherson	Reg. No. 46,255

DUANE MORRIS LLP
1667 K Street, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: (202) 776-7800
Telecopier: (202) 776-7801

Dated: October 6, 2005